

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and in view of the reasons that follow.

Claims 13, 14, 22 and 23 are currently being cancelled.

Claims 1, 15, 16 and 17-20 are currently being amended.

No claims are currently being added.

This amendment amends and cancels claims in this application. A detailed listing of all claims that are, or were, in the application, irrespective of whether the claims remain under examination in the application, is presented, with an appropriate defined status identifier.

After amending the claims as set forth above, claims 1-12 and 15-21 are now pending in this application.

It is respectfully requested that this after-final amendment and reply be considered and entered, since it is believed to place this application in condition for allowance, and since at the very least it lessens the number of issues for a potential appeal.

In this Office Action, claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite, for the reasons set forth on page 3 of the Office Action. Due to the cancellation of claims 22 and 23, this rejection as well as the prior art rejection of these claims are now moot.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-14, 16, 17 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,796,394 to Wicks; claims 5, 15, 18 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wicks in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,112,244 to Moore; and claim 21 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wicks and Moore in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,072,468 to Hocker. These rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the presently pending claims for at least the reasons given below.

First, please note that claims 1, 17 and 19 have been amended to clarify that the claimed processing unit obtains a prescribed information that is setup data or input data for an application program, and carries out a prescribed processing to enter the setup data or the input data into a portable terminal device in a form utilizable by the application program, without using the user interface, whereby these features were originally recited in claims 13 and 14 (now canceled). Because of these features, it is possible to realize an improvement of handling of a user interface and/or omission of tedious operations in a portable terminal device which has a function for connecting to a prescribed computer network and a function for executing application programs but which is also associated with a poor handling of a user interface because of its compact or very compact body size (see page 4, lines 17-26 and page 34, line 23 to page 35, line 17 of the specification).

Turning now to the cited art of record, Wicks does not disclose or suggest anything directed to such a portable terminal device with an improved handling of a user interface and/or omission of tedious operations, because Wicks' handheld device has no function for entering setup data or input data in a form utilizable by an application program, without using a user interface.

In this regard, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the claimed processing unit is disclosed in column 5, lines 5-19 and 39-47 of Wicks, as the processor unit inside the handheld device 110.

However, column 5, lines 5-19 of Wicks merely describes that a base station 108 is connected to a computer 122 via a LAN, that computers 124, 122 and 114 are interconnected via the LAN, and that the radio transmission using the CT-2 standard with the handheld communicator is the primary mode of communication between the base station and the device and the other modes are secondary modes. Furthermore, column 5, lines 39-47 of Wicks merely describes that the base station shows graphically whether the user or any other user has electronic mail, voice messages, faxes, etc., and that the user can retrieve voice messages, have the electronic mail and faxes delivered to the user's computer, have a fax printed out, copy the information to other users,

place the information in a low priority stack or perform other functions, by pressing a key on the handheld communicator or the base station.

The quoted portions of Wicks fail to disclose or suggest a portable terminal device that obtains any setup data or input data of an application program from a local network. The quoted portions of Wicks also fail to disclose or suggest a portable terminal device that carries out any processing to enter the setup data or the input data into the portable terminal device in a form utilizable by the application program, without using the user interface.

Thus, Wicks actually fails to disclose or suggest several features recited in presently pending claims 1, 17 and 19, and thus those claims are not anticipated by Wicks.

The same argument also applies to the dependent claims 2-12.

Next, please note that claims 15, 18 and 20 have been amended clarify that the claimed processing unit returns a reply containing an identification information or a prescribed information related to the specified type of application program that is setup data or input data of the application program to be entered into the portable terminal device in a form utilizable by the application program, without using a user interface of the portable terminal device. Because of this feature, it is possible to provide a computer device that supports a portable terminal device in order to enable improvement of handling of a user interface or omission of tedious operations in the portable terminal device of claim 1 (see page 4, lines 27-34 and page 35, lines 18-29 of the present specification).

Turning now to the cited art of record, Wicks and Moore do not teach or suggest anything directed to such a computer device for supporting a portable terminal device.

In more detail, the Office Action incorrectly asserts that the claimed processing unit is disclosed in column 4, line 48 to column 5, line 5 of Moore.

However, column 4, line 48 to column 5, line 5 of Moore merely describes that a memory of a processing system includes a selective call address, a

message processing element, and codebooks utilized for compressing/decompressing messages which can be downloaded wirelessly or through a wired network via a conventional wireline interface.

The quoted portion of Moore fails to disclose or suggest any setup data or input data of an application program to be entered into a portable terminal device in a form utilizable by the application program, without using a user interface of the portable terminal device, and the quoted portions of Moore also fail to disclose or suggest any computer device that returns a reply containing such an information to the portable terminal device via the local network.

Thus, any combination of Wicks and Moore fails to teach or suggest anything corresponding to the claimed processing unit, and therefore claims 15, 18 and 20 are not obvious over the combined teachings of Wicks and Moore.

The same argument also applies to the dependent claim 16 and 21.

It is also noted that Hocker does not rectify the shortcomings of Wicks and Moore discussed above.

In conclusion, presently pending claims 1-12 and 15-21 are patentably distinct over the cited art of record.

Therefore, since there are no other objections or rejections raised in the Office Action, Applicants believe that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and an early indication of allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone if it is felt that a telephone interview would advance the prosecution of the present application.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by a check being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 19-0741. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 19-0741.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

May 7, 2004

Phillip J. Articola
Phillip J. Articola
Registration No. 38,819

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 22428
Telephone: (202) 672-5300
Facsimile: (202) 672-5399